

EDITORIALS.

THE LATEST RADICAL MEASURE.

The New York Times makes the following brief but pointed remarks in reference to the bill introduced by Senator Hoar on behalf of the Judiciary Committee:

"The anti-polygamy bill reported yesterday from the Senate Judiciary Committee is a much more radical measure than that introduced by Mr. Edmunds and referred to the committee near the beginning of the session. It not only makes provision for certifying and recording marriages and proving the facts of bigamy and polygamy, but it practically destroys the corporate powers of the Mormon Church, wipes out the Perpetual Emigrating Fund Company, and places the registration of voters and conduct of elections in the control of a board to be appointed by the President. It deals with the Territory of Utah as if the existence of polygamy forfeited its right to any of the functions of a self-governing community; but it leaves the way open for it to re-establish the right by simply giving up the surviving twin relic of barbarism. It is a question whether the bill does not go so far as to endanger its chance of becoming a law."

CHATEL MORTGAGES.

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah,
February 7, 1884.

Editor Deseret News:

Solomon says: "In a multitude of counselors there is safety." My apology for writing this is to be found in the communication published in your issue of Feb. 6, and signed "Index." The writer seems to be laboring under some erroneous ideas of the nature and effect of the bill recently introduced into the Council by Councillor Barton, "C. F. 14," a bill for an act in relation to chattel mortgages, and he hopes it will not pass. Index calls these laws bad legislation and says that every nineteenth person in England is a pauper; he further holds that all legislation tending to pauperize the people is demoralizing.

I hold with Index that legislation which tends to pauperize is bad, but does this chattel mortgage act have any such tendency? Had Index procured a copy and studied it he would have found out that it does not. Does it pauperize any person to make him pay his just debts? We will suppose a case, and I will say here that it is a case which has frequently happened. A person comes here, and attempts to start in business, say to keep a lodging house. He goes to a furniture dealer and buys his entire house furnishings on the instalment plan, that is, to pay so much a month until it is paid for. He pays the first instalment and starts up. Business is dull and in a couple of months he is heavily involved. The furniture man can not get back his goods for the pretended purchaser has sold them: his only remedy is by an action for debt, and frequently he sees his goods taken on an execution levied on a judgment in favor of some other creditor. This should not be; he should have a lien on these goods until the price has been paid to him, and this law will provide a means for him to acquire such lien. Neither could these goods be mortgaged to any other person as Index supposes, for this is strictly guarded against under this law.

Supposing the poor farmer, whom Index brings to the front, has chairs, beds, plows and team in his possession, and he has not paid for them, does it impoverish and pauperize him to have them taken away by the person to whom they rightfully belong? These articles are in the possession of hundreds of farmers to-day who have not paid for them, neither do they make any effort to pay for them. How then could it pauperize them to have them taken away? Should it not be possible for a man who has trusted people for goods, and who can not get his pay, to get back his property? Common honesty says it should.

Such a law is much needed here, and it is now in force in nearly all the States and Territories of the Union, the result being beneficial. No law of this nature or any mortgage law, whether of real estate or chattels, can force any person to mortgage his property, personal or real, but it affords a means of compelling people to pay for goods which they purchase on credit, and no legislation is bad which compels this, for it tends to keep people from getting into debt, as they know that they will be compelled to pay.

VINDEX.

A FEW WORDS TO OUR YOUNG FOLKS.

There are certain amusements which, though perhaps harmless in themselves, are placed under the ban in consequence of the evil uses to which they are frequently put, or the places where they are indulged in, or the common association with them of things that are essentially evil. We need not particularize. Our young people know what they are because of their being forbidden. This gives them promi-

ence. In undisciplined minds, too, it fosters a desire to indulge in them. Let the voice of authority and of wisdom say such or such a thing should not be done, and like the forbidden fruit in the primeval paradise, it becomes an object of strong desire and a powerful temptation.

Our young people should make themselves acquainted with the reasons for the counsels that are given for their guidance. The advice imparted concerning abstinence from certain kinds of amusement springs from the highest and kindest motives. It is not intended to clip the wings of their pleasure, nor to deprive them of their proper privileges, but to preserve them from evil and secure their protection against the sorrows that surely come from wrong doing. Some of them are too apt to resent good counsel when it interferes with their wishes, and to plume themselves on their own assumed strength of character, and the depth of their inexperienced judgment. They would show much greater sense in respectful attention to the admonitions of older heads, and more strength of mind by reverence and submission to the wishes of parents or guardians.

There is one thing in this connection to which we direct their special attention. Laws are made for the wicked. Regulations are established to restrain evil doers. But the good and the pure have to obey them as well as the sinful. On the same principle rules have to be formulated to prevent the improper use of things in themselves not harmful. And the pure in heart as well as the corrupt, the strong-minded as well as the weak, have to subscribe to them for the general good. And in thus yielding up indulgence in their own inclinations for the benefit of the community, the spirit of sound patriotism, genuine politeness and true manhood and womanhood are grandly exhibited. There are things which might be safely participated in by some persons which could not be by others, and therefore they are forbidden to all.

A high-strung and impetuous yet pure-minded young man or woman may say, "I will not deny myself a harmless pleasure because some one else makes evil of it." Yet that is the very reason, young friend, why you should forego that little indulgence. Your example works the very evil that it is desired to avoid. Your good name and the very virtues you possess are taken advantage of by others, who are not to be trusted, as an excuse for their perversions.

Regard for the good of others is one of the highest marks of true civilization. No one is really cultured who is not actuated by it. It is the essence of gentility. It is an integral part of real religion. Its opposite is selfishness—the bane of the world, the source of most of the sorrows which afflict nations, families and individuals. It is selfishness which prompts indulgence in things forbidden for the general good. It is selfishness which keeps up practices and amusements that some cannot participate in without danger of contamination. It is selfishness which moves the young to disregard the rights and wishes of the old. It is selfishness which causes the crowding out from our public amusements of those who have built up the country and made it possible for the younger people to live here; by the monopoly of the floor at dancing parties, for instance, and the introduction of "round dances" with which they are not familiar, and to which they are opposed for reasons which hold good in the best ordered circles outside as well as inside of Utah, that courtesy and respect for their seniors which are evidences of good breeding in the youth, are sometimes made conspicuous by their absence.

Now, will not our young friends who have no desire to do wrong, but simply wish to enjoy themselves in their own way—even if it is a forbidden way—thinking that they have the right to choose their own amusements and not perceiving why they should be restrained, just reflect a little on their duties and responsibilities as members of society, and the exalted character of motives that look to the welfare of the community at the sacrifice of some self-indulgence? They are simply asked to forego some trifling pleasures—which may be substituted by others quite as gratifying when the mind is resolutely turned from the first—in order to comply with regulations established for the common good by the wisest and most esteemed among the people. Is this too much to ask of them? Or are they so steeped in selfishness—one of the lowest promptings of our fallen nature—that the nobler impulses of the soul and the grandest teachings of the saviors of mankind, have no force to lift them towards the plane where stand the holiest and happiest men and women of all the ages, who have won their crowns and gained their abiding joys through self-sacrifice, self-control and strong regard for the good of others?

A STARTLING STATEMENT.

It has been stated by parties in whose word reliance can be placed, that at the last masquerade ball at the Skating Rink men went to that place of promiscuous resort dressed in female attire, and occupied the same dressing rooms as women.

This is a startling statement and more than sustains the position we have taken in relation to the "villion."

Assuming the report regarding the invasion of the ladies' dressing rooms by men to be correct, there being good grounds for believing it to be so, it may be pertinent to ask respectable people whether they can any more afford to encourage such a concern by their presence. They certainly cannot do so without being tainted by the very act of frequenting a place where conduct so gross and reprehensible is even possible.

One of the chief reasons of our anxiety in relation to the Pavilion has been the fact that it has been frequented by numbers of respectable people. We are satisfied that no inducement could have attracted them there had they been aware of the true character of the place. Now that they are becoming informed of its real status they visit it no more.

The statement in regard to what took place at the masquerade has been made by parties who were in attendance.

A DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE.

"CHARLES W. PENROSE, of Utah, and Editor of the DESERET NEWS wrote only a short time ago, that polygamy was not an essential part of Mormonism; but Apostle Teasdale of the Utah Twelve, seems to hold a contrary opinion. In a late discourse in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, the Apostle said:

"I don't go back on one principle of the gospel. I believe in plural marriage as much as I do in baptism for the remission of sins. I will not give up one of my principles. I do not fear to face man. As for God, I'd fear to go behind the veil and meet those who would know I had given up the first principle of the gospel. I bear testimony that plural marriage is a necessity—the Church can't exist without it. It is one of the landmarks of the Church."

Which is right, the Apostle or the Church organ?"

The foregoing is from the Lamoni (Iowa) Herald, published in the interest of the "Josephites" and edited by Joseph Smith, the leader of that sect. It is a piece of pettifoggery, characteristic of the editor and many of his followers. They seem to delight in taking advantage of words containing apparent, but not real discrepancies, and most of their contentions, which are very numerous among themselves, are about verbal differences rather than essential principles. They are also very disingenuous, often endeavoring to apply meanings to phrases used by their adversaries not intended by those who uttered them nor warranted by the language.

It is the same in this case. The article in reference to polygamy made to do service in the above paragraph from the Lamoni Herald, appeared in the DESERET EVENING NEWS of December 7th, 1881—not a very "short time ago," but the date does not matter much. We stated that, "Correctly speaking, polygamy is not now and never has been a tenet of the 'Mormon' faith. Our religious system of marriage is different altogether from that which is known in the world as polygamy." This was said in answer to the assertion of President Arthur in his message to Congress, that polygamy was "the corner stone of the Mormon Church." We showed further, that though "our plural wife system has become an essential part of our faith, it is not and has not been the 'corner stone' of the Church."

Now wherein does this differ from the statement of Elder Teasdale? We stated that plural marriage is "essential," he said, "it is a necessity." In answer to the question, "Which was right—the Apostle or the Church organ?" we say—and we think any person who understands plain language and does not want to quibble will say—both were right, for both said the same thing in different words.

But to make this matter still plainer and to close the mouths of carpers and those who would "make a man an offender for a word," we subsequently explained fully the difference between polygamy and the "Mormon" system of plural marriage. We defined bigamy and also polygamy. The first is in the nature of fraud and deception from beginning to end. The second is the marrying of several wives or husbands, or unrestricted matrimony on the part of either sex. This we showed is "not Mormon marriage." Even polygyny, which signifies the marrying of several wives, we explained was not a proper term to use in reference to "Mormon" matrimony. Celestial marriage is the correct term. For, it was established and is regulated, administered and entered into under a celestial law revealed from heaven, and is not to be compared with any system of Asiatic or other polygamy or polygyny practised in the world.

All this we fully explained at the time, but the Lamoni Herald did not have the grace nor the honesty to insert a word of it, because the object its editor had in view was to manufacture a conflict of statements between the News and Brother Teasdale; and any quotation of our article beyond the two or three words cited would have been fatal to his strained and unwarranted inference. But what can be expected of one who shuts his eyes to the most direct testimony on the question of his father's teaching and practice of celestial marriage, and who answers facts with suppositions, and stern evidence with quibblings, because, in his own language, he "prefers not to believe."

INCREASE OF ANARCHISM.

AUSTRIA is afflicted with a Socialistic nightmare. That country is fast approaching a similar condition to that to which Russia has attained. Several murders of prominent officials by anarchists have occurred of late, while others are in contemplation. On the list of persons proscribed for sentence of death by the "secret combination" are, so it is stated, the Emperor and Empress, the Crown Prince Rudolph, the Crown Princess Stephanie, Baron Rothschild, all the editors of the Neue Freie Presse and the Wiener Tagblatt, Prefect of Police Koticka, Commissary of Police Frankel, Ministers, bankers and Deputies, many of whom belong to the liberal party, and many merchants.

Recently a large quantity of dynamite was ordered at a Presburg factory for the Arlberg tunnel. The explosive was sent by the Westbahn Railroad, but on its arrival at the station in Vienna one large case of dynamite, weighing 150 kilogrammes, was missing. The police made a thorough search for it, but in vain.

Private letters are now opened by the police at the Postoffice, and a constant search for dynamite cartridges is being made. The Emperor, the palace, all the public buildings are guarded, and the newspapers are not allowed to publish anything about the anarchists unless it has been previously submitted to the police.

Thus are the foundations of the governments of Europe being undermined. They are crumbling and there seems to be no power capable of impeding the progress of anarchism. It appears as if the culminating point of civilization had been reached and the down grade to a species of barbarism was being taken. The revolutionary spirit is rampant and the day approaches when thrones will totter, and fall, and "all that can be shaken will be shaken." We are living in remarkable times.

PRESS COMMENTS ON THE "HOAR" BILL.

The comments of the press on the so-called "Anti-polygamy Bill" introduced by Senator Hoar are very amusing to one acquainted with "Mormon" affairs, and thus able to perceive the general lack of understanding concerning them, prominently exhibited both by our national legislators and the writers for the public who criticize congressional legislation.

The opinions of the press vary very much as to the merits of the bill. Some think it an "important move;" others say that the "important move" is so "plainly unconstitutional that it would not stand for a moment as law," and characterize it as "a stupid violation of all principles of law and morals." Some think that if it becomes a law "its passage will almost entirely mark the era of the decadence of Mormonism;" others think that the country "cannot afford to confiscate the Mormon funds and convert them into campaign ammunition." The provision in regard to husbands and wives giving evidence against each other in bigamy cases, is regarded by some as "eminently proper," while others denounce it as contrary to every principle of common law, and "one of the most sweeping pieces of proposed legislation to be found outside of the Draconian code."

Many journals make a mistake as to the last named provision. It is not simply to make it lawful for a husband or wife to testify against the other in any prosecution for bigamy, polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, but to compel such evidence. It gives power to courts to send their officers, without previous subpoena, to kidnap a wife whose evidence is wanted, and under threats of pains and penalties to force her to testify against her husband. This distinction should be understood. It is not in merely making the evidence of the wife against the husband lawful that the bill violates established principles of jurisprudence, but in seizing and compelling the wife or husband to testify against the other; and this was denounced by the late eminent jurist, Jeremiah S. Black, not only as "anti-constitutional," but as an inhuman disregard of family feeling and the sanctities of private life.

The proposition to turn over the funds and property of the Church into the hands of trustees appointed by the President and Senate meets with almost universal disfavor, and no one can find anything to say in its support except as "a plan to rid this country of polygamy." So with the provision in regard to the Perpetual Emigrating Fund Company, and such papers as countenance it do so under the impression that it will stop the proselyting system of the "Mormon" Church and the immigration of its members from the nations of Europe.

If these matters were understood, it would be seen that there is nothing in the measure which is likely to have any powerful effect on the polygamy question; that the "Mormon" Church is not dependent upon the act of the Legislature by which it was made a legal corporation; that the missionary work of this Church is entirely independent of the Perpetual Emigrating Fund; that the work of the gathering of the Saints from all nations would not be stopped and could not be to any great extent impeded by the dissolution of the P. E. Company as a cor-

poration. The framers of the bill do not understand the Church, its work or its methods. They are fumbling in the dark. They are aiming blows in directions that do not lead towards the object they have in view. They are striking at some things that do not exist, and at others the nature of which they do not comprehend. And it is much the same with the writers for the press who comment on their proceedings. What is needed by anti-"Mormon" legislators and editors is correct information. But this they will not seek for, and to make their position worse, they receive for facts and adopt for wisdom the rankest kind of falsehood and the baldest kind of folly.

We agree with some of our contemporaries that this new attempted legislation is not likely to pass in its present shape. We think it unlikely to go through the Senate unshorn of some of its crudities and unclipped of some of its perversions of constitutional and common law. And even should it be passed by a Republican Senate, in order to throw the odium of defeating a so-called anti-polygamy measure upon a Democratic House, so as to utilize the blame for political capital, we do not think that a House so largely composed of men who stand on constitutional ground, will come down to the level of such demagogic dirt as to do violence to their profoundest convictions of right for fear of the unjust taunts and shallow charges of their political opponents. The Edmunds-Hoar-Judiciary bill is a monstrosity and ought to be strangled in the birth. If it should be permitted to see the light of life, it will prove to be a weakening instead of "a giant measure," and its effect against "Mormonism" will be a solemn nothing.

ROTHACKER'S RAVINGS.

The Denver Tribune appears to be edited by a maniac, judging from the ravings that appear in its columns about the "Mormons." Here is a specimen:

"We have said before that the least of Mormon crimes is polygamy. We reassert it. The refusal to recognize the nation as the real government of this country is much worse. The effort to strengthen the treason by colonizing the Territories with creatures of the kind is a civil secession which will yet result in something disastrous to the public. The same power which was used to destroy the Ku Klux organization should be employed to destroy the more powerful Mormon organization. There is not a single reason which justifies the firing of a gun at the Confederate soldiery, which will not hold in an attack on those who equally defy the national authority in Utah. The principle is precisely the same, only in one case it was States rights and slaves, and in another case it was Mormon impudence, murder and polygamy. The main trouble with Congress is that it knows nothing about the question at all. It is an ignorant body, utterly unfit to legislate on general matters."

The Tribune writer is great as a re-asserter. This is evident in all his remarks in relation to Utah and its people. He asserts and re-asserts that they refuse to recognize the government. The assertion is bare and totally unsupported, and, moreover, is untrue, the Government being recognized and sustained here as much as elsewhere. Rothacker should not make himself sick over an imaginary impending disaster to the dear public, against whom the "Mormons" have no sinister designs.

The asserter and re-asserter is very logical, for he characterizes the colonizing of the Territories as "a civil secession." What relation colonization has to secession can only be discerned in the condition of mind into which the Tribune editor has fallen. He is evidently a disciple of Talmage, advocating the solution of what is termed the "Mormon question" by fire and sword. He must have been in a fearful temper while writing, as he not only soundly abuses the "Mormons" while betraying a woeful ignorance of their true character, but shows his teeth at Congress. The "Mormons" are accustomed to be abused and do not care anything about such vaporous fumings, but it might make Congress feel bad to be called "an ignorant body, utterly unfit to legislate on general matters."

How is it that the Coloradans do not discover the merits of Mr. Rothacker and send him to Congress to put that august body in the right path? According to the re-asserter he knows more than all of the Senators and Representatives combined. He does not appear to be troubled with any conspicuous amount of modesty. But he should keep cool and not exhibit the weakness of his intellect and the acerbity of his temper through the columns of a public journal. His friends should put ice on his head.

THE HIGHER ORDINANCES.

We give space to the following communication for the reason that attempts are being made by the leaders of the society commonly known as the "Josephites" to make it appear that the sacred endowments were not authorized and administered by the Prophet Joseph, but were invented and